

OAHU RAILWAY & LAND CO.'S

TIME TABLE:

REGULAR TRAINS.			
	A. M.	P. M.	
Leave Honolulu	9:00	2:00	
Arrive Manana	10:15	3:15	
Leave Manana	11:00	4:00	
Arrive Honolulu	11:45	4:45	

SUNDAY TRAINS.			
	A. M.	P. M.	
Leave Honolulu	9:30	12:30	
Arrive Manana	10:45	3:45	
Leave Manana	11:30	4:30	
Arrive Honolulu	12:15	5:15	

PORT OF HONOLULU, H. I.

Tides, Sun and Moon.			
Day	Time	Height	Depth
Mon	10:30	10.0	10.0
Tue	11:30	10.0	10.0
Wed	12:30	10.0	10.0
Thu	13:30	10.0	10.0
Fri	14:30	10.0	10.0
Sat	15:30	10.0	10.0
Sun	16:30	10.0	10.0

Meteorological.			
Day	Time	Barom.	Therm.
Mon	8:30	30.10	75.0
Tue	9:30	30.10	75.0
Wed	10:30	30.10	75.0
Thu	11:30	30.10	75.0
Fri	12:30	30.10	75.0
Sat	13:30	30.10	75.0
Sun	14:30	30.10	75.0

SHIPPING INTELLIGENCE.

ARRIVALS.	
Stmr Akamai from Waianae and Waialua.	Thursday, June 19.
Stmr Lehua from Hamakua.	Thursday, June 19.
Stmr James M. McKee, Macaulay, from Kauai.	Thursday, June 19.
Stmr J. A. Cummins, Nelson, from Koolau.	Thursday, June 19.

DEPARTURES.	
Stmr Kaimiloa for Kauai.	Thursday, June 19.

VESSELS LEAVING TO-DAY.	
Stmr W. G. Hall for Hawaii and Maui at 10 a.m.	
Stmr Akamai for Waianae and Waialua at 9 a.m.	
Stmr C. R. Bishop, Le Claire, for Waianae, Waialua and Koolau at 9 a.m.	
Stmr Lehua, Clarke, for Niihau and Hahaione at 4 p.m.	
Schr Luka for Kohala.	
Jap stmr Sagami Maru, Kenderline, for Yokohama at 12 m.	

VESSELS IN PORT.	
U. S. S. Charleston, Remey, from San Fran.	
Bk M. S. Acorn, Pollard, Esquimaux.	
Bk M. S. Morning Star, Garland, Gilbert Ids.	
Bk Omega, Brown, Hongkong.	
Bk Planter, Dow, San Francisco.	
Ship Borrowdale, Guthrie, Liverpool.	
Bk F. S. Thompson, Potter, San Francisco.	
Bk Discovery, McNeil, San Fran.	
Tern Ramon, Hodson, Eureka.	
Bk W. H. Dimond, Drew, San Fran.	
Bk Thor, Steiner, Newcastle, N. S. W.	
Bk J. A. Chester, Plum, San Fran.	
Bk Omph, Newcastle, N. S. W.	
Bk S. N. Castle, Underwood, San Fran.	
Bk J. A. Chester, Plum, Port Townsend.	
Stmr Sagami Maru, Japan.	
Bk S. Allen, San Francisco.	
Bk Ceylon, Calhoun, San Francisco.	

SHIPPING NOTES.	
The stmr J. A. McKee brought 2,618 bags sugar from Koolau.	
The schooner Luka brought 1,800 bags of sugar from Kohala.	
The steamer Lehua brought 2,550 bags of sugar and 50 head cattle from Hamakua.	

LOCAL AND GENERAL.

Regular cash sale by Mr. James F. Morgan at 10 o'clock to-day.

The steamer W. G. Hall sails on her usual route this morning at 10 o'clock.

Look in our advertising columns for a notice of sale of Kealia blooded stock.

The executive committee of the Hui Kalaianui meets on Saturday evening next.

The Japanese steamer Sagami Maru sails for Yokohama at 12 o'clock to-day.

A rifle has been found. The owner may apply to F. R. Harvey, I. I. S. N. wharf.

Bids are wanted at the Interior Office for furnishing 12,000 feet of eight inch water pipe. See notices elsewhere.

It is not customary to bind the report of the Board of Immigration with that of the Minister of the Interior, and the former will be issued shortly.

This morning's ADVERTISER contains an announcement of the opening of the Pearl City Lunch Room, at our incipient neighbor city. The full list of attractions will be found in the advertisement.

The Nominating Convention of the Reform Party will be held at the Old Armory Saturday evening at 7:30 o'clock, to nominate a Noble to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Hon. J. A. Cummins.

The first number of a new quarterly entitled the "Honolulu Diocesan Magazine and Quarterly Record of Church work for the Diocese," has been issued. It consists of sixteen pages, octavo, and is published under the direction of Bishop Willis.

At a meeting of the Pioneer Building & Loan Association held yesterday, a charter was accepted, and the following persons were elected as Directors: G. E. Boardman, F. T. Lansing, S. B. Rose, W. A. Bowen, J. H. Fisher, J. M. Dowsett, A. W. Richardson and Henry Smith.

FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Minority Report of the Committee Presented to the Legislative Assembly by Hon. H. P. Baldwin, June 14, 1890.

(Continued.)

STATEMENT OF THE MAJORITY OF THE COMMITTEE COMPARED WITH THE FACTS.

After careful examination of the testimony before us, I fail to find as charged by the majority report, that a certain duplicity has never been absent from the transactions of the Cabinet in respect of the Treaty matter. The evidence particularly of Messrs. Austin, Thurston and Damon is straightforward, and carries conviction that they in no way wish to cover the truth. Rep. Kalua's resolution did not call for private correspondence nor for Cabinet minutes. Nevertheless the Minister of Foreign Affairs has shown me the Cabinet minutes relating to Treaty matters, and is ready at any time to show the same to the rest of the committee. I find no evidence whatever that the obnoxious clause relating to "landing troops" was in any way premeditated, but that it was merely suggested by Mr. Carter that the United States might ask that this clause be put into the Treaty, if they were to guarantee the independence of Hawaii. Minister Ashford says that this clause was at first unanimously agreed to; that after discussion it was subsequently struck out, for the reason that it would give the existing Government in the country a right to demand compensation for the loss of the right to land troops. His Majesty would certainly object to it, but that he understood it might be inserted afterwards in Washington. Mr. Ashford's statement on this point is not corroborated by any evidence, either oral or documentary, and is positively denied by all the other members of the Cabinet, who state that the first time the clause came before them in written form, they decided unanimously that they would not consent to any such proposition.

The evidence of Messrs. Austin, Thurston and Damon differs in minor points, but agrees remarkably in all important points, more especially in regard to the motives which governed their actions from first to last.

The majority report, in order to show that the "Ministerial utterances" were not reliable, brings up an important point to illustrate the charge (alluding to "Addition to Article 4"), that Minister Austin positively says that these additions only came in much later, as a sequence to the discussion of the other Articles, and Minister Thurston corroborates this, whilst Ministers Damon and Ashford distinctly state that the clause appeared in appendix, at the very first presentation of the draft.

Now all the evidence before us goes to show that the Cabinet had several meetings to discuss the proposed Treaty; that they first had a pencil copy, then a type written copy, and it is not at all to be wondered at that after a lapse of ten months there should be a slight difference of recollection as to the exact Cabinet meeting at which the "Landing of troops" clause was first brought up for consideration, besides which I can find no statement in Minister Austin's evidence that the troop clause "came in much later." The main point in connection with this clause is not when it first came up for consideration, but what was done with it, upon which the three Ministers concur.

The majority report characterizes the remarks made by Minister Thurston to His Majesty at the Cabinet council of December 20th last, as being "rather brutal." This, to say the least, is a very extravagant, inappropriate and unwarranted use of the term. Mr. Thurston's remarks at that time, in calling on His Majesty to do what he (Thurston) considered to be His Majesty's duty, were plain and positive, but in no sense of the term could they be characterized as "brutal."

After discussing a number of irrelevant matters not included in the resolution of the house, such as rumors of annexation, the motives of the ministers; the deluding or intimidating of His Majesty, the majority of the committee conclude that there were two objectionable clauses in the proposed Treaty, viz.:

1. "The one in Article 4, by which we were to be deprived of the sovereign right of concluding treaties with other nations."

2. "One in Article 6, by which we were denied the equal sovereign right of terminating the treaty otherwise than by unanimous consent."

The majority of the committee advance no explanation of their first point, make no argument and give no reasons for their conclusion.

The reason that they do not is self-evident from the fact that there is no such clause in the treaty, nor any semblance of such clause. This statement of the committee is therefore a direct and uncalculated misrepresentation.

The only mention of treaties in such section is that in consideration of the United States guaranteeing the independence of the Hawaiian Islands, the Hawaiian Government should inform the United States of any treaties which it proposed to negotiate with any other country. There is no suggestion of the "consent" of the United States being required, or of any limitation to be placed upon our present rights in that respect.

As the first point made by the majority of the committee, has absolutely no foundation in fact, it is not necessary to consider it further than to call attention to it as a most signal illustration of the partisan spirit in which that report is drawn.

THE COMMITTEE'S SECOND POINT.

The committee's second point is that of Article 6 of the Treaty: "We were denied the sovereign right of terminating the treaty, otherwise than by unanimous consent," and they subsequently speak of this section as binding "perpetually" and "the perpetuity obligation on our side."

The committee advances no proof, reason, argument or precedent to show that the right to terminate a treaty at pleasure being a "sovereign right," not to be modified or parted with, it has been continuously treated simply as one of the terms of a contract

to be varied according to varying circumstances and as their parties may think their interests require.

Reference to Hawaiian treaties shows that the first treaty ever made with this country was with the United States in 1826, and it appears with the declaration that "The peace and friendship" subsisting between the two countries is "hereby confirmed and declared to be perpetual."

According to the logic of the majority of the committee, this country was thereby deprived of the "sovereign right" to declare war, if it thought best to do so. In 1839, the first French treaty was made. Article 1, reads: "There shall be perpetual peace and friendship" between the two sovereigns "their heirs and successors."

In 1846 the first British treaty was made, Article 1, reads: "There shall be perpetual peace and amity" between the two sovereigns "their heirs and successors." An "additional article," of the same date as the treaty, reads: "This treaty shall not be permanently binding until the ratification of the King of Denmark." The treaty was thereafter ratified by the King of Denmark, and is therefore by its terms a "permanent" or "perpetual" treaty.

In 1848, a treaty was made with Hamburg, containing the same wording.

In 1850 a new treaty was made with the United States, wherein it is again declared that "perpetual peace and amity" shall exist between the two countries.

In 1852 a new British treaty was made. Article 17 provides that at any time after the expiration of seven years from the date of the treaty, either party shall have the right to terminate Articles 4, 5 and 6 of the treaty on "twelve months' notice." The only logical inference from this is that the remainder of the treaty is perpetual.

In 1854 a treaty was made with Bremen, which duplicates the wording used in the Denmark and Hamburg treaties about "perpetually binding" the two countries.

In 1855 a treaty was made with Sweden and Norway, which opens with a declaration of "perpetual friendship," and in Article 17 states a right of termination of the treaty on Articles 4, 5 and 6 only. The treaty concludes with the "perpetually binding" clause of the Denmark and Hamburg treaties.

In 1858 a new treaty was made with France, opening with a declaration of "constant peace and perpetual friendship."

This treaty leaves nothing to logic or inference, but states that it shall remain in force for ten years, after which twelve months' notice of termination of certain articles may be given. "But that in regard to the other articles, the said treaty shall remain nevertheless, perpetually obligatory, and cannot be modified except by a mutual agreement between the two contracting parties."

It is useless to particularize further, as these are simply samples of the treaties which Hawaii has been making with other countries ever since it became a recognized government. It will be observed that in every instance given above, not only Hawaii but, France, the United States, Denmark and all the other countries have been binding themselves to "perpetual" and "permanent" treaties, to be terminated only by "mutual consent," to the same degree that Hawaii has; so that according to the majority of the committee all these countries have during the past sixty years been recklessly surrendering "sovereign right."

The fact is that the Cabinet were proposing, concerning this point, no more than has been done over and over again by the Hawaiian Government, and no more than the proudest and most powerful nations of the world have voluntarily incorporated in their treaties with Hawaii.

I do not accuse the majority of the committee of malicious intent, but I do say that they have shown gross ignorance.

CONCLUSION OF THE MINORITY OF THE COMMITTEE.

The direction of the House to the committee was two-fold:

1st.—To report whether the proposed treaty was intended, or calculated to in any wise jeopardize the political independence of Hawaii.

2nd.—To report whether the proposed treaty was intended, or calculated to in any wise jeopardize the commercial independence of Hawaii.

There is no evidence, either oral or documentary, that there has been anything but the most absolute and disinterested good faith on the part of the Cabinet and the Hawaiian Minister at Washington, and a sincere endeavor on their part to advance the commercial prosperity of Hawaii.

The reference to the proposed treaty in connection with the proposed treaty which have been made, are unworthy of any honest man. There is no party and no individual, that I know of, having any voice or control in Hawaiian affairs, who is in favor of annexation, or of the United States, or any other country, or who is not honestly and heartily in favor of the maintenance and perpetuation of Hawaiian independence and autonomy. So well known is this that declarations of that kind are not included in our Treaty, and consequently pay a duty in the United States:

PRESENT DUTY.

Tobacco, 35c to \$1 per lb.
Wool, 10c to 12c per lb.
Lemons, 10c per box, 15c per ft.
Oranges, 12c per box, 15c per ft.
Limes, 20c per cent. ad valorem.
Figs and Raisins, 25c per lb.
Castor beans, 50c per 50 lbs.
Cattle, 20c per cent. ad valorem.
Sheep, 20c per cent. ad valorem.
Rams, (present duty unknown).
Fruits preserved in their juices, 25c per cent. ad valorem.
Beef, mutton and pork, 1c per lb.
Hemp, 25c per ton.

DUTY PROPOSED IN THE MCKINLEY BILL.

Tobacco, 40c to \$2 50 per lb.
Wool, 10c to 12c per lb.
Lemons, 12c per box, 15c per ft.
Oranges, 25c per box, 15c per ft.
Limes, 25c per box, 15c per ft.
Figs and Raisins, 25c per lb.
Castor beans, 32c to 50c per lb.
Cattle, more than 1 year old, \$10.
Sheep, \$1 50 per head.
Rams, 15c per cent. ad valorem.
Fruits preserved in their juices, 30c per cent. ad valorem.
Beef, mutton and pork, 2c per lb.
Hemp, \$25 per ton.

Now, the day is far distant when the United States will have all protection whatever, either in the shape of duty or a bounty, from their raw sugar industry, for if they do, I believe that industry will in time be blotted out.

But even if they should do so, our own benefit would be the present treaty with the United States were rendered entirely nugatory so far as sugar is concerned, I contend that it will be profitable for this country to continue treaty relations with the United States on the basis of the present treaty.

I believe that under the stimulus of free trade, there are several industries mentioned above, that would become flourishing industries, such as wool, sheep, cattle, tobacco, oranges, lemons and limes, castor beans, preserved pineapples and ramie. Mr. McKinley, in his tariff bill, proposes a tariff on ramie. I quote the following from his tariff report: "Ramie is a remarkable fiber, which will if encouraged soon be woven into a great variety of the finest and most beautiful fabrics. The present season ramie is being grown in many Southern States. It has passed the ex-

perimental stage and a great and valuable industry will be secured to the South by its protection." I need not say that ramie grows here better than it does in the Southern States, as it is a tropical plant.

Under the stimulus of free trade all other industries mentioned above including wool are industries that the small farmer, any one with small means, can engage in, be they natives or foreigners. Under the present treaty bananas are the only fruit we raise to any extent for foreign shipment admitted into the United States duty free—witness the flourishing condition of that industry, every year increasing.

It should be the policy of the Hawaiian Government to enact such legislation, whether by treaty or otherwise as will encourage the smaller industries in the country, and make business profitable for small capitalists. Thus will the kuleanas of the native Hawaiians throughout the country become valuable property and they will not be so dependent as they now are on wages for a living.

I feel that it is an evil that this country is so dependent on the sugar industry, and it is also an evil that there are not many small land owners throughout the country. It is not for the interest of this country to be dependent on one industry only, as any cause that would leave this industry profligate, would be a serious blow to all operations in the country. I say without hesitation, that with the only our present treaty, the McKinley tariff bill threatens with one blow to paralyze the business of this country, and reduce very materially the value of property throughout the country.

Until plantations can greatly reduce their running expenses, and the present rates of wages to what they were before we obtained the present treaty, there will be no profit in the business. The people of the native Hawaiian, will feel this more than those who are better off.

But some say the United States might remove all duties on products such as we raise, and thus render entirely nugatory all benefits under a free trade treaty, and as one of the terms of the proposed treaty is that it shall be terminated only by mutual consent, we would find ourselves helplessly bound. It is not at all likely that we, and I might say our children, either under a free trade treaty, when the United States will remove all protection, either in the shape of duties or bounties, on all articles such as we raise here, and I am convinced that if we could be so fortunate as to obtain the commercial treaty proposed by the Cabinet, we would have no cause to fear such a clause—that on account of continued commercial advantages under such a treaty, it is not at all likely we should ever want to see it terminate.

The United States is our natural and only commercial ally. If little Hawaii can be so fortunate as to come into a free trade alliance with this great and prosperous country, with unlimited resources that are increasing and developing yearly, will surely share in, and reap the benefits of her prosperity, not in one way, certainly in other ways, and our prosperity will be established on a more healthy and substantial basis.

THE OBJECT OF THE CABINET.

I finally desire to call attention to the fact that although the Executive has the legal right to negotiate and execute treaties, without consulting the Legislature, the Cabinet in this instance, have undertaken no such course.

All that they have endeavored to do was to set the matter in motion, so as to get it to a position where, after consultation with the Legislature, action could be taken, favorably or otherwise, as circumstances might indicate.

The statements made that the Cabinet advised the King to sign a Treaty, and by the Attorney-General that he advised the King "not to sign that Treaty," do not seem to be borne out by the evidence.

The King has never been asked to sign a Treaty. All that he has been asked to do by the Cabinet was to sign a commission authorizing Mr. Carter to enter negotiations with the United States, and to preliminarily agree upon a form of Treaty, which should be subject to ratification by the King, the Cabinet, and the Hawaiian Legislature.

On this point I quote from the Cabinet council minutes: "Iolani Palace, December 20, 1889: The Minister of Foreign Affairs said: 'That the Cabinet, in the belief, that it is desirable to have a definite statement of what the United States Government is willing to agree to, for presentation to the Legislature, advise His Majesty to sign the authorization here presented.'"

The situation then is that the Cabinet was endeavoring to formulate a measure for presentation to the Legislature for its consideration.

Such measure has not been advanced to a stage at which anything can be done by the House concerning it.

Whether the Legislature, as a body, approve of each and every point in the proposed treaty or not, is not the issue.

Without raising any party issue or expressing any approval or disapproval of the particular points in the treaty, the Cabinet can be given the credit for having attempted to bring before the House for consideration a subject, admitted by all to be of the greatest importance.

H. P. BALDWIN,
Of Committee on Foreign Relations.

Advertisements.

PACIFIC HARDWARE CO., Ltd.,

B. F. DILLINGHAM, Pres. J. G. SPENCER, Manager. F. L. WINTER, Treas.

THE VERY LATEST IN

Piano Lamps, Banquet Lamps, Library Lamps, Hall Lamps, and Chandeliers.

Just Received from the Factory.

A NEW LINE OF REFRIGERATORS

A Full Line of the Favorite

Eddy's Refrigerators and Ice Chests.

DISSTON'S SAWS AND FILES; NEW LINES OF LOCKS, AND

Shelf Hardware, Etc.,

Planet Jr. Cultivators.

PICTURE FRAMES AND MOULDINGS.

PACIFIC HARDWARE CO., Ltd.,

Fort and Merchant Streets.

11-41

EX ALEX. McNEIL,

Hartman's Steel Wire Fence

Cheaper Than Wood!

FOR SALE BY

HAWAIIAN HARDWARE CO.,

Opposite Spreckels & Co.'s Bank,

129-41

FOR STREET.

UP-TOWN

Book, News and Stationery Store

106 FORT STREET.

DANA'S CHARACTERISTICS

—OF—

VOLCANOES!

—AND—

FORNANDER'S

POLYNESIAN RACES

TO BE HAD COMPLETE.

THOS. G. THURM,

PROPRIETOR.

NOTICE.

HAVING BOUGHT OUT MR. W. H.

Page in the Honolulu Carriage Manu-

factory, at 128 Fort Street, I am prepared

to continue the above business under the

old name of Honolulu Carriage Manu-

factory, and being an old experienced carriage

builder I solicit the patronage of my old

friends and the public in general, and with

my thorough knowledge of the business

and with experienced workmen and using

only the best material I guarantee general

satisfaction. Please call and see me before

going elsewhere.

(Signed) GIDEON WEST,

Honolulu, Oct. 28, 1889. 103-41

Firewood For Sale,

CUT AND SPLIT FOR STOVE USE.

\$16 per cord, at the

40-W COMMERCIAL SALESROOMS,

140-F Cor. Queen and Nuuanu Sts.

J. E. GOMES,